arXiv:1612.06286v1 [math.MG] 19 Dec 2016

A Federer-style characterization of sets of finite perimeter on metric spaces *

Panu Lahti

December 20, 2016

Abstract

In the setting of a metric space equipped with a doubling measure that supports a Poincaré inequality, we show that a set E is of finite perimeter if and only if $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E) < \infty$, that is, if and only if the codimension one Hausdorff measure of the 1-*fine boundary* of the set's measure theoretic interior I_E is finite.

1 Introduction

Federer's structure theorem states that a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is of finite perimeter if and only if $\mathcal{H}(\partial^* E)$ is finite, see [11, Section 4.5.11]. Here $\mathcal{H}$ is the codimension one (in this case, $k-1$-dimensional) Hausdorff measure, and $\partial^* E$ is the measure theoretic boundary of E. In a complete metric space X equipped with a doubling measure that supports a Poincaré inequality, the "only if" direction has been shown by Ambrosio, see [1], but the "if" direction remains open.

In this paper we define for $A \subset X$ the *1-fine boundary* $\partial^1 A$, which always contains $\partial^* A$ but can be strictly larger; for example on the real line, the 1-fine boundary coincides with the topological boundary. However, using a fine continuity result for BV functions given in [21], we show that for any set of finite perimeter E, denoting the measure theoretic interior of E by I_E, the

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 30L99, 31E05, 26B30.
Keywords: metric measure space, bounded variation, finite perimeter, Federer's characterization, measure theoretic boundary, fine boundary.

difference $\partial^1 I_E \setminus \partial^* E$ is $\mathcal{H}$-negligible. In particular, then $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E) < \infty$. In showing this, we first prove a suitable characterization of the 1-fine boundary, in analogy with what is known in the case $p > 1$, see [6, Section 7].

Then we show that the condition $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E) < \infty$ is also sufficient for E to be of finite perimeter. For this, we generalize further concepts and results of fine potential theory from the case $p > 1$ to the case $p = 1$; all such considerations appear to be new even in the Euclidean setting. In particular, we study the existence of *capacitary potentials* and prove weak analogs of the *Cartan property* for solutions of obstacle problems, and of the *Choquet property* for finely open sets. These have recently been studied for $p > 1$ in the metric setting in [8, 9]; see also [24] and [16] for the Euclidean theory and its history in the unweighted and weighted settings, respectively.

Our result is the following — see Section 2 for the definitions.

Theorem 1.1. *For an open set $\Omega \subset X$ and a μ-measurable set $E \subset X$, we have $P(E, \Omega) < \infty$ if and only if $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E \cap \Omega) < \infty$. Furthermore, then $\mathcal{H}((\partial^1 I_E \setminus \partial^* E) \cap \Omega) = 0$.*

Necessity is given by Theorem 4.7 in Section 4. Sufficiency is given by Theorem 5.1 in Section 5. The results of [23] and [21] are used extensively in the proofs.

Acknowledgments. The research was funded by a grant from the Finnish Cultural Foundation. The author wishes to thank Nageswari Shanmugalingam for reading the manuscript and providing useful comments.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we introduce the notation, definitions, and assumptions used in the paper.

In this paper, (X, d, μ) is a complete metric space equipped with a Borel regular outer measure μ satisfying a doubling property, that is, there is a constant $C_d \geq 1$ such that

$$0 < \mu(B(x, 2r)) \leq C_d \, \mu(B(x, r)) < \infty$$

for every ball $B = B(x, r)$ with center $x \in X$ and radius $r > 0$. We assume that X consists of at least two points. By iterating the doubling condition,

we obtain that for any $x \in X$ and $y \in B(x,R)$ with $0 < r \le R < \infty$, we have

$$\frac{\mu(B(y,r))}{\mu(B(x,R))} \ge \frac{1}{C_d^2}\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^Q, \tag{2.1}$$

where $Q > 1$ only depends on the doubling constant C_d. When we want to specify that a constant C depends on the parameters $a, b, \ldots$, we write $C = C(a, b, \ldots)$.

A complete metric space with a doubling measure is proper, that is, closed and bounded sets are compact. Since X is proper, for any open set $\Omega \subset X$ we define $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ to be the space of functions that are Lipschitz in every open $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$. Here $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$ means that $\overline{\Omega'}$ is a compact subset of Ω. Other local spaces of functions are defined similarly.

For any set $A \subset X$ and $0 < R < \infty$, the restricted spherical Hausdorff content of codimension one is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_R(A) := \inf\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(B(x_i,r_i))}{r_i} : A \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B(x_i,r_i),\, r_i \le R\right\}.$$

The codimension one Hausdorff measure of $A \subset X$ is given by

$$\mathcal{H}(A) := \lim_{R\to 0} \mathcal{H}_R(A).$$

The measure theoretic boundary $\partial^* E$ of a set $E \subset X$ is the set of points $x \in X$ at which both E and its complement have positive upper density, i.e.

$$\limsup_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r)\cap E)}{\mu(B(x,r))} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r)\setminus E)}{\mu(B(x,r))} > 0.$$

The measure theoretic interior and exterior of E are defined respectively by

$$I_E := \left\{x \in X : \lim_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r)\setminus E)}{\mu(B(x,r))} = 0\right\} \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$O_E := \left\{x \in X : \lim_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r)\cap E)}{\mu(B(x,r))} = 0\right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Note that we always have a partitioning of the space into the disjoint sets $\partial^* E$, I_E, and O_E. Moreover, $I_{X\setminus E} = O_E$. By the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, for a *μ-measurable* set E we have $\mu(E \Delta I_E) = 0$ and $\mu((X\setminus E)\Delta O_E) = 0$, where Δ is the symmetric difference, and so $I_E = I_{I_E}$ and $\partial^* E = \partial^* I_E$.

A curve is a rectifiable continuous mapping from a compact interval into X. The length of a curve γ is denoted by ℓ_γ. We will assume every curve to be parametrized by arc-length, which can always be done (see e.g. [13, Theorem 3.2]). A nonnegative Borel function g on X is an upper gradient of an extended real-valued function u on X if for all curves γ, we have

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \le \int_\gamma g \, ds, \tag{2.4}$$

where x and y are the end points of γ. We interpret $|u(x) - u(y)| = \infty$ whenever at least one of $|u(x)|$, $|u(y)|$ is infinite. Of course, by replacing X with a set $A \subset X$ and considering curves γ in A, we can talk about a function g being an upper gradient of u in A. Upper gradients were originally introduced in [17].

If g is a nonnegative μ-measurable function on X and (2.4) holds for 1-almost every curve, we say that g is a 1-weak upper gradient of u. A property holds for 1-almost every curve if it fails only for a curve family with zero 1-modulus. A family Γ of curves is of zero 1-modulus if there is a nonnegative Borel function $\rho \in L^1(X)$ such that for all curves $\gamma \in \Gamma$, the curve integral $\int_\gamma \rho \, ds$ is infinite.

Given an open set $\Omega \subset X$, we consider the following norm

$$\|u\|_{N^{1,1}(\Omega)} := \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \inf \|g\|_{L^1(\Omega)},$$

where the infimum is taken over all 1-weak upper gradients g of u in Ω. The substitute for the Sobolev space $W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ in the metric setting is the Newton-Sobolev space

$$N^{1,1}(\Omega) := \{u : \|u\|_{N^{1,1}(\Omega)} < \infty\}.$$

We understand Newton-Sobolev functions to be defined everywhere (even though $\|\cdot\|_{N^{1,1}(\Omega)}$ is, precisely speaking, then only a seminorm). For more on Newton-Sobolev spaces, we refer to [27, 5, 18].

Next we recall the definition and basic properties of functions of bounded variation on metric spaces, following [25]. See also e.g. [2, 10, 12, 28] for the classical theory in the Euclidean setting. For $u \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$, we define the *total variation* of u in X by

$$\|Du\|(X) := \inf \left\{ \liminf_{i\to\infty} \int_X g_{u_i} \, d\mu : \, u_i \in \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{loc}}(X), \, u_i \to u \text{ in } L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(X) \right\},$$

where each g_{u_i} is an upper gradient of u_i. We say that a function $u \in L^1(X)$ is *of bounded variation*, and denote $u \in \mathrm{BV}(X)$, if $\|Du\|(X) < \infty$. By replacing X with an open set $\Omega \subset X$ in the definition of the total variation, we can define $\|Du\|(\Omega)$. For an arbitrary set $A \subset X$, we define

$$\|Du\|(A) = \inf\{\|Du\|(\Omega) : \, A \subset \Omega, \, \Omega \subset X \text{ is open}\}.$$

If $\|Du\|(X) < \infty$, $\|Du\|(\cdot)$ is a finite Radon measure on X by [25, Theorem 3.4]. A μ-measurable set $E \subset X$ is said to be of *finite perimeter* if $\|D\chi_E\|(X) < \infty$, where χ_E is the characteristic function of E. The perimeter of E in Ω is also denoted by

$$P(E, \Omega) := \|D\chi_E\|(\Omega).$$

Similarly as above, if $P(E, \Omega) < \infty$, then $P(E, \cdot)$ is finite Radon measure on Ω.

For any Borel sets $E_1, E_2 \subset X$, we have by [25, Proposition 4.7]

$$P(E_1 \cup E_2, X) \le P(E_1, X) + P(E_2, X).$$

The proof works equally well for μ-measurable $E_1, E_2 \subset X$ and with X replaced by any open set Ω. Then by approximation from the outside by open sets, we obtain for any $A \subset X$

$$P(E_1 \cup E_2, A) \le P(E_1, A) + P(E_2, A). \tag{2.5}$$

We have the following coarea formula from [25, Proposition 4.2]: if $U \subset X$ is an open set and $u \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(U)$, then

$$\|Du\|(U) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(\{u > t\}, U) \, dt. \tag{2.6}$$

We will assume throughout that X supports a $(1,1)$-Poincaré inequality, meaning that there exist constants $C_P \ge 1$ and $\lambda \ge 1$ such that for every ball $B(x,r)$, every locally integrable function u on X, and every upper gradient g of u, we have

$$\fint_{B(x,r)} |u - u_{B(x,r)}| \, d\mu \le C_P r \fint_{B(x,\lambda r)} g \, d\mu,$$

where

$$u_{B(x,r)} := \fint_{B(x,r)} u \, d\mu := \frac{1}{\mu(B(x,r))} \int_{B(x,r)} u \, d\mu.$$

The $(1,1)$-Poincaré inequality implies the so-called Sobolev-Poincaré inequality, see e.g. [5, Theorem 4.21], and by applying the latter to approximating locally Lipschitz functions in the definition of the total variation, we get the following Sobolev-Poincaré inequality for BV functions. For every ball $B(x,r)$ and every $u \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$, we have

$$\left(\fint_{B(x,r)} |u - u_{B(x,r)}|^{Q/(Q-1)} \, d\mu \right)^{(Q-1)/Q} \leq C_{SP} r \frac{\|Du\|(B(x,2\lambda r))}{\mu(B(x,2\lambda r))},$$

where Q is the exponent from (2.1) and $C_{SP} = C_{SP}(C_d, C_P, \lambda) \geq 1$ is a constant. For a μ-measurable set $E \subset X$, this implies (see e.g. [20, Equation (3.1)])

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\min\{\mu(B(x,r) \cap E), \mu(B(x,r) \setminus E)\}}{\mu(B(x,r))} \right)^{(Q-1)/Q} \leq C_{SP} r \frac{P(E, B(x,2\lambda r))}{\mu(B(x,2\lambda r))}.$$

Rearranged, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\min\{\mu(B(x,r) \cap E), \mu(B(x,r) \setminus E)\} \\ &\quad \leq 2C_{SP} r \left(\frac{\min\{\mu(B(x,r) \cap E), \mu(B(x,r) \setminus E)\}}{\mu(B(x,r))} \right)^{1/Q} P(E, B(x,2\lambda r)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Moreover, the $(1,1)$-Poincaré inequality implies the following Sobolev inequality. If $x \in X$, $0 < r < \frac{1}{4}\operatorname{diam}(X)$, and $u \in N^{1,1}(X)$ with $u = 0$ in $X \setminus B(x,r)$, then

$$\int_{B(x,r)} |u| \, d\mu \leq C_S r \int_{B(x,r)} g_u \, d\mu \tag{2.8}$$

for any upper gradient g_u of u and a constant $C_S = C_S(C_d, C_P) \geq 1$, see [5, Theorem 5.51]. By approximation, we obtain that for any $x \in X$, any $0 < r < \frac{1}{4}\operatorname{diam}(X)$, and any μ-measurable set $E \subset B(x,r)$, we have

$$\mu(E) \leq C_S r P(E, X). \tag{2.9}$$

The 1-capacity of a set $A \subset X$ is given by

$$\operatorname{Cap}_1(A) := \inf \|u\|_{N^{1,1}(X)}, \tag{2.10}$$

where the infimum is taken over all functions $u \in N^{1,1}(X)$ such that $u \geq 1$ in A. We know that Cap_1 is an outer capacity, meaning that

$$\mathrm{Cap}_1(A) = \inf\{\mathrm{Cap}_1(U) : U \supset A \text{ is open}\}$$

for any $A \subset X$, see e.g. [5, Theorem 5.31]. If a property holds outside a set $A \subset X$ with $\mathrm{Cap}_1(A) = 0$, we say that it holds 1-quasieverywhere. If $u \in N^{1,1}(X)$, then $\|u - v\|_{N^{1,1}(X)} = 0$ if and only if $u = v$ 1-quasieverywhere, see [5, Proposition 1.61].

The variational 1-capacity of a set $A \subset D$ with respect to a set $D \subset X$ is given by

$$\mathrm{cap}_1(A, D) := \inf \int_X g_u \, d\mu,$$

where the infimum is taken over functions $u \in N^{1,1}(X)$ and upper gradients g_u of u such that $u \geq 1$ in A (equivalently, 1-quasieverywhere in A) and $u = 0$ in $X \setminus D$. We know that cap_1 is also an outer capacity, in the sense that if $\Omega \subset X$ is a bounded open set and $A \Subset \Omega$, then

$$\mathrm{cap}_1(A, \Omega) = \inf\{\mathrm{cap}_1(U) : U \text{ open}, \, A \subset U \subset \Omega\},$$

see [5, Theorem 6.19]. For basic properties satisfied by capacities, such as monotonicity and countable subadditivity, see e.g. [5].

Given a set $E \subset X$ of finite perimeter, for $\mathcal{H}$-almost every $x \in \partial^* E$ we have

$$\gamma \leq \liminf_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r) \cap E)}{\mu(B(x,r))} \leq \limsup_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r) \setminus E)}{\mu(B(x,r))} \leq 1 - \gamma, \tag{2.11}$$

where $\gamma \in (0, 1/2]$ only depends on the doubling constant and the constants in the Poincaré inequality, see [1, Theorem 5.4]. For an open set $\Omega \subset X$ and a μ-measurable set $E \subset X$ with $P(E, \Omega) < \infty$, we know that for any Borel set $A \subset \Omega$,

$$P(E, A) = \int_{\partial^* E \cap A} \theta_E \, d\mathcal{H}, \tag{2.12}$$

where $\theta_E \colon X \to [\alpha, C_d]$ with $\alpha = \alpha(C_d, C_P, \lambda) > 0$, see [1, Theorem 5.3] and [3, Theorem 4.6].

The lower and upper approximate limits of an extended real-valued function u on X are defined respectively by

$$u^\wedge(x) := \sup\left\{ t \in \overline{\mathbb{R}} : \lim_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r) \cap \{u < t\})}{\mu(B(x,r))} = 0 \right\} \tag{2.13}$$

and

$$u^\vee(x) := \inf\left\{t \in \overline{\mathbb{R}} : \lim_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r)\cap\{u>t\})}{\mu(B(x,r))} = 0\right\}. \tag{2.14}$$

Note that for $u = \chi_E$ with $E \subset X$, we have $x \in I_E$ if and only if $u^\wedge(x) = u^\vee(x) = 1$, $x \in O_E$ if and only if $u^\wedge(x) = u^\vee(x) = 0$, and $x \in \partial^* E$ if and only if $u^\wedge(x) = 0$ and $u^\vee(x) = 1$.

We understand BV functions to be μ-equivalence classes. To consider fine properties, we need to consider the pointwise representatives $u^\wedge$ and $u^\vee$.

We need to generalize concepts of fine potential theory from the case $p > 1$ to the case $p = 1$. The following definition can be taken directly from e.g. [9].

Definition 2.1. A set $A \subset X$ is 1-*quasiopen* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an open set $G \subset X$ with $\operatorname{Cap}_1(G) < \varepsilon$ such that $A \cup G$ is open.

Next we define the fine topology in the case $p = 1$.

Definition 2.2. We say that $A \subset X$ is 1-thin at the point $x \in X$ if

$$\lim_{r\to 0} r\frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r)\cap A, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} = 0.$$

We also say that a set $U \subset X$ is 1-finely open if $X \setminus U$ is 1-thin at every $x \in U$. Then we define the 1-fine topology as the collection of 1-finely open sets on X.

We denote the 1-fine interior of a set $G \subset X$, i.e. the largest 1-finely open set contained in G, by fine-int G. We denote the 1-fine closure of a set $G \subset X$, i.e. the smallest 1-finely closed set containing G, by $\overline{G}^1$. We define the 1-fine boundary of a set $G \subset X$ by $\partial^1 G := \overline{G}^1 \setminus$ fine-int G.

Finally, we define the 1-*base* $b_1 G$ of a set $G \subset X$ as the set of points where G is *not* 1-thin.

Note that always $b_1 G \subset \overline{G}^1$. See [21, Section 4] for motivation of the definition of 1-thinness, and for a proof of the fact that the 1-fine topology is indeed a topology.

3 The 1-fine boundary

In this section we give a suitable characterization of the 1-fine boundary.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $A \subset X$, we have $I_A \cup \partial^* A \subset b_1 A$ and $\partial^* A \subset \partial^1 A$.*

Proof. Suppose $x \in X \setminus b_1 A$, so that

$$\lim_{r\to 0} r\frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r)\cap A, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} = 0.$$

By the definition of the variational capacity, for every $r > 0$ we find a non-negative function $u_r \in N^{1,1}(X)$ such that $u_r \geq 1$ in $B(x,r)\cap A$, $u_r = 0$ in $X \setminus B(x,2r)$, and u_r has an upper gradient g_r with

$$\frac{r}{\mu(B(x,r))}\int_X g_r \, d\mu \to 0 \qquad \text{as } r \to 0.$$

But by the Sobolev inequality (2.8),

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{r\to 0}\frac{\mu(B(x,r)\cap A)}{\mu(B(x,r))} &\leq \limsup_{r\to 0} C_d \fint_{B(x,2r)} u_r \, d\mu \\ &\leq \limsup_{r\to 0} 2C_S C_d r \fint_{B(x,2r)} g_r \, d\mu = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $x \notin I_A \cup \partial^* A$.

To prove the second claim, note that by the first claim,

$$\overline{A}^1 \supset b_1 A \supset I_A \cup \partial^* A$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\text{fine-int}\, A = X \setminus \overline{X\setminus A}^1 &\subset X \setminus b_1(X\setminus A) \\ &\subset X \setminus (I_{X\setminus A} \cup \partial^* A) = X \setminus (O_A \cup \partial^* A) = I_A.\end{aligned}$$

By combining these, we obtain $\partial^1 A = \overline{A}^1 \setminus \text{fine-int}\, A \supset \partial^* A$. □

Next we gather some known results.

Lemma 3.2 ([21, Lemma 4.3])**.** *Let $x \in X$, let $r > 0$, and let $G \subset X$ be a μ-measurable set with*

$$\frac{\mu(B(x,2r)\cap G)}{\mu(B(x,2r))} \leq \frac{1}{2C_d^{\lceil \log_2(128\lambda)\rceil}}. \tag{3.1}$$

Then for some constant $C_1 = C_1(C_d, C_P, \lambda)$,

$$\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r)\cap I_G, B(x,2r)) \leq C_1 P(G, B(x,2r)).$$

Moreover, it is straightforward to show that for any set $A \subset X$ and any ball $B(x,r)$,

$$\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r)\cap A, B(x,2r)) \le C_d \mathcal{H}(B(x,r)\cap A). \tag{3.2}$$

This can be deduced by using suitable cutoff functions.

In the particular case of a set of finite perimeter, the 1-fine closure is essentially just the measure theoretic closure; this is essentially contained in [21, Proposition 4.4], but we repeat the proof here.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $E \subset X$ be a set of finite perimeter. Then there exists a $\mathcal{H}$-negligible set $N \subset X$ such that*

$$\overline{I_E}^1 \subset I_E \cup \partial^* E \cup N.$$

Proof. By [4, Theorem 2.4.3] we know that if ν is a Radon measure on X, $t > 0$, and $A \subset X$ is a Borel set for which we have

$$\limsup_{r\to 0} r\frac{\nu(B(x,r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \ge t$$

for all $x \in A$, then $\nu(A) \ge t\mathcal{H}(A)$. Since E is of finite perimeter, we have $\mathcal{H}(\partial^* E) < \infty$ by (2.12). By using (3.2) and the above density result with $\nu = \mathcal{H}|_{\partial^* E}$, we get

$$\limsup_{r\to 0} r\frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r)\cap \partial^* E, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \le C_d \limsup_{r\to 0} r\frac{\mathcal{H}(B(x,r)\cap \partial^* E)}{\mu(B(x,r))} = 0 \tag{3.3}$$

for $\mathcal{H}$-almost every $x \in X \setminus \partial^* E$, that is, for every $x \in X \setminus (\partial^* E \cup N)$ with $\mathcal{H}(N) = 0$.

By Lemma 3.2, if $x \in X$ and $r > 0$ satisfy

$$\frac{\mu(B(x,2r)\cap E)}{\mu(B(x,2r))} \le \frac{1}{2C_d^{\lceil \log_2(128\lambda)\rceil}},$$

then $\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r)\cap I_E, B(x,2r)) \le C_1 P(E, B(x,2r))$. Thus we get for all

$x \in X \setminus (I_E \cup \partial^* E \cup N)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{r\to 0} r\frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r)\cap I_E, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} &\le C_1 \limsup_{r\to 0} r\frac{P(E,B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \\
&\overset{(2.12)}{\le} C_1 C_d \limsup_{r\to 0} r\frac{\mathcal{H}(\partial^* E\cap B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \\
&\le C_1 C_d^2 \limsup_{r\to 0} r\frac{\mathcal{H}(\partial^* E\cap B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,2r))} \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

by the equality in (3.3). By combining this with (3.3), and (3.2) with $A = N$, we have

$$\limsup_{r\to 0} r\frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r)\cap (I_E\cup\partial^* E\cup N), B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} = 0$$

for all $x \in X \setminus (I_E \cup \partial^* E \cup N)$. Thus $I_E \cup \partial^* E \cup N \supset I_E$ is a 1-finely closed set, so that $\overline{I_E}^1 \subset I_E \cup \partial^* E \cup N$. □

Theorem 3.4 ([21, Corollary 5.4])**.** *Let $u \in N^{1,1}(X)$. Then u is continuous (in the sense of a real-valued function) with respect to the* 1*-fine topology* 1*-quasieverywhere.*

By [14, Theorem 4.3, Theorem 5.1] we know that if $A \subset X$,

$$\operatorname{Cap}_1(A) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \mathcal{H}(A) = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $x \in X$, let $0 < r < \operatorname{diam}(X)/8$, and let $A \subset B(x,r)$ with*

$$r\frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(A,B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \le \frac{1}{8C_S C_d^{\lceil \log_2(128\lambda)\rceil}}. \tag{3.5}$$

Then we have

$$\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r)\cap \overline{A}^1, B(x,2r)) \le C_1 \operatorname{cap}_1(A,B(x,2r)),$$

where $C_1 = C_1(C_d, C_P, \lambda)$ is the constant from Lemma 3.2.

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. By the definition of the variational capacity and the fact that it is an outer capacity, we can pick $u \in N^{1,1}(X)$ with $u \geq 1$ in a neighborhood of A, $u = 0$ in $X \setminus B(x, 2r)$, and

$$\operatorname{cap}_1(A, B(x, 2r)) + \varepsilon \geq \int_X g_u \, d\mu \geq \|Du\|(X),$$

where g_u is an upper gradient of u, and where the last inequality follows from the fact that Lipschitz functions are dense in $N^{1,1}(X)$, see e.g. [5, Theorem 5.1]. By using the coarea formula (2.6), we find a number $t \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$P(\{u > t\}, X) \leq \|Du\|(X) \leq \operatorname{cap}_1(A, B(x, 2r)) + \varepsilon. \tag{3.6}$$

By the isoperimetric inequality (2.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(\{u > t\}) &\leq 2C_S r P(\{u > t\}, X) \\
&\leq 2C_S r \operatorname{cap}_1(A, B(x, 2r)) + 2C_S r\varepsilon \\
&\overset{(3.5)}{\leq} 2C_S r \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{8C_S C_d^{\lceil \log_2(128\lambda)\rceil} r} + 2C_S r\varepsilon \\
&= \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{4C_d^{\lceil \log_2(128\lambda)\rceil}} + 2C_S r\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus by assuming that $\varepsilon \leq \mu(B(x, r))/(8C_S C_d^{\lceil \log_2(128\lambda)\rceil} r)$, we have

$$\frac{\mu(\{u > t\})}{\mu(B(x, 2r))} \leq \frac{\mu(\{u > t\})}{\mu(B(x, r))} \leq \frac{1}{2C_d^{\lceil \log_2(128\lambda)\rceil}},$$

and now by Lemma 3.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x, r) \cap I_{\{u>t\}}, B(x, 2r)) &\leq C_1 P(\{u > t\}, B(x, 2r)) \\
&\leq C_1 P(\{u > t\}, X) \\
&\leq C_1 \operatorname{cap}_1(A, B(x, 2r)) + C_1\varepsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

by (3.6). Again by the definition of the variational capacity, we find a function $v \in N^{1,1}(X)$ with $v \geq 1$ in $B(x, r) \cap I_{\{u>t\}}$, $v = 0$ in $X \setminus B(x, 2r)$, and

$$\int_X g_v \, d\mu \leq \operatorname{cap}_1(B(x, r) \cap I_{\{u>t\}}, B(x, 2r)) + \varepsilon, \tag{3.8}$$

where g_v is an upper gradient of v. Note that

$$A \subset B(x,r) \cap \operatorname{int}(\{u > t\}) \subset B(x,r) \cap I_{\{u>t\}}. \tag{3.9}$$

For a suitable $\mathcal{H}$-negligible set $N \subset X$, by (3.9) and Lemma 3.3 we have

$$B(x,r) \cap \overline{A}^1 \subset B(x,r) \cap \overline{I_{\{u>t\}}}^1 \subset B(x,r) \cap (I_{\{u>t\}} \cup \partial^*\{u > t\} \cup N). \tag{3.10}$$

Let $\widetilde{N} \subset X$ be the set of points where v is not 1-finely continuous. By Theorem 3.4, $\operatorname{Cap}_1(\widetilde{N}) = 0$, and then by (3.4), also $\mathcal{H}(\widetilde{N}) = 0$. If $y \in B(x,r) \cap \partial^*\{u > t\} \setminus \widetilde{N}$, we deduce $y \in B(x,r) \cap b_1 I_{\{u>t\}} \setminus \widetilde{N}$ by applying Lemma 3.1 with $A = I_{\{u>t\}}$ and noting that $\partial^*\{u > t\} = \partial^* I_{\{u>t\}}$. Thus necessarily $v(y) \geq 1$. Thus $v \geq 1$ 1-quasieverywhere in the set

$$B(x,r) \cap (I_{\{u>t\}} \cup \partial^*\{u > t\} \cup N).$$

Thus by (3.10), $v \geq 1$ 1-quasieverywhere in $B(x,r) \cap \overline{A}^1$, and so by (3.7) and (3.8), we get

$$\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \cap \overline{A}^1, B(x,2r)) \leq \int_X g_v \, d\mu \leq C_1 \operatorname{cap}_1(A, B(x,2r)) + C_1\varepsilon + \varepsilon.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, we obtain the result. □

Now we can give a suitable characterization of the 1-fine interior. We take the proof almost directly from [6, Proposition 7.8], where it is given for $p > 1$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $A \subset X$. Then* $\operatorname{fine-int} A = A \setminus b_1(X \setminus A)$.

Proof. If $x \in \operatorname{fine-int} A$, then by definition $X \setminus \operatorname{fine-int} A$ is 1-thin at x, and thus so is $X \setminus A$. Thus $x \in A \setminus b_1(X \setminus A)$.

Conversely, assume that $X \setminus A$ is 1-thin at $x \in A$, i.e.

$$\lim_{r \to 0} r \frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \setminus A, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,2r))} = 0. \tag{3.11}$$

For every $r > 0$, let $F_r := \overline{B(x,r) \setminus A}^1$. Fix $s > 0$. We show that F_s is 1-thin at x. By (3.11) it suffices to show that for sufficiently small $0 < r \leq s$,

$$\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \cap F_s, B(x,2r)) \leq C \operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \setminus A, B(x,2r)) \tag{3.12}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Note that for $0 < r \leq s$, $F_r \cup (X \setminus B(x,r))$ is 1-finely closed and contains $X \setminus A$, and hence also contains F_s. Thus

$$B(x,r) \cap F_s \subset B(x,r) \cap (F_r \cup (X \setminus B(x,r))) = B(x,r) \cap F_r.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \cap F_s, B(x,2r)) &\leq \operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \cap F_r, B(x,2r)) \\ &\leq C_1 \operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \setminus A, B(x,2r)) \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently small $0 < r \leq s$ by Lemma 3.5. This establishes (3.12), and thus F_s is 1-thin at x. The set $B(x,s) \setminus F_s$ is 1-finely open and contained in A, and since F_s is 1-thin at x, the set $(B(x,s) \setminus F_s) \cup \{x\}$ is also 1-finely open, and contained in A. Thus $(B(x,s) \setminus F_s) \cup \{x\} \subset \text{fine-int}\, A$, and so $x \in \text{fine-int}\, A$. □

Now we can characterize the 1-fine closure and the 1-fine boundary in the following way.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $A \subset X$. Then $\overline{A}^1 = A \cup b_1 A$ and*

$$\partial^1 A = (A \cap b_1(X \setminus A)) \cup ((X \setminus A) \cap b_1 A).$$

Proof. Note that $\overline{A}^1 = X \setminus \text{fine-int}(X \setminus A)$. Thus by Proposition 3.6,

$$\overline{A}^1 = X \setminus ((X \setminus A) \setminus b_1 A) = A \cup b_1 A.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^1 A = \overline{A}^1 \setminus \text{fine-int}\, A &= (A \cup b_1 A) \setminus (A \setminus b_1(X \setminus A)) \\ &= (A \cup b_1 A) \cap ((X \setminus A) \cup b_1(X \setminus A)) \\ &= (A \cap b_1(X \setminus A)) \cup (b_1 A \cap (X \setminus A)). \end{aligned}$$

□

The following proposition can be taken directly from [9, Lemma 4.8], where it is given in the case $p > 1$. The proof is also verbatim the same, except that instead of referring to [9, Theorem 4.3] we refer to Theorem 3.4.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $A \subset X$. Then $\operatorname{Cap}_1(\overline{A}^1) = \operatorname{Cap}_1(A)$. If $A \subset D \subset X$, then*

$$\operatorname{cap}_1(A,D) = \operatorname{cap}_1(\overline{A}^1 \cap D, D).$$

If furthermore $\operatorname{cap}_1(A,D) < \infty$, then $\operatorname{Cap}_1(\overline{A}^1 \setminus \text{fine-int}\, D) = 0$ and

$$\operatorname{cap}_1(A,D) = \operatorname{cap}_1(\overline{A}^1 \cap \text{fine-int}\, D, \text{fine-int}\, D).$$

4 Necessity of $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E) < \infty$

In this section we consider the quasicontinuity and fine continuity properties of BV functions and in particular sets of finite perimeter, and show that every set of finite perimeter E satisfies the condition $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E) < \infty$.

The following quasicontinuity-type result is essentially given by [23, Theorem 1.1], and later proved in precisely the given form in the below reference. Recall the definitions of the lower and upper approximate limits $u^\wedge$ and $u^\vee$ from (2.13) and (2.14).

Theorem 4.1 ([22, Corollary 4.3])**.** *Let $\Omega \subset X$ be an open set, let $E \subset X$ be a μ-measurable set with $P(E, \Omega) < \infty$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists an open set $G \subset \Omega$ with $\mathrm{Cap}_1(G) < \varepsilon$ such that if $y_k \to x$ with $y_k, x \in \Omega \setminus G$, then*

$$\min\{|\chi_E^\wedge(y_k) - \chi_E^\wedge(x)|,\, |\chi_E^\wedge(y_k) - \chi_E^\vee(x)|\} \to 0$$

and

$$\min\{|\chi_E^\vee(y_k) - \chi_E^\wedge(x)|,\, |\chi_E^\vee(y_k) - \chi_E^\vee(x)|\} \to 0.$$

Recall that a set $A \subset X$ is 1-*quasiopen* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an open set $G \subset X$ with $\mathrm{Cap}_1(G) < \varepsilon$ such that $A \cup G$ is open.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\Omega \subset X$ be an open set and let $E \subset X$ be a μ-measurable set with $P(E, \Omega) < \infty$. Then the sets $I_E \cap \Omega$ and $O_E \cap \Omega$ are 1-quasiopen.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $G \subset \Omega$ be an open set obtained by applying Theorem 4.1, so that $\mathrm{Cap}_1(G) < \varepsilon$. Let $V := (I_E \cap \Omega) \cup G$. To check that V is open, note first that if $x \in G$, then of course $B(x, r) \subset G \subset V$ for some $r > 0$. If $x \in (I_E \cap \Omega) \setminus G$, then by Theorem 4.1 there exists $r > 0$ with $B(x, r) \setminus G \subset (I_E \cap \Omega) \setminus G$, and thus

$$B(x, r) \subset (I_E \cap \Omega) \cup G = V.$$

Thus V is open.

Since $P(X \setminus E, \Omega) = P(E, \Omega)$ and $O_E = I_{X \setminus E}$, also $O_E \cap \Omega$ is 1-quasiopen. □

The following fact and its proof are essentially the same as in the case $p > 1$, see [8, Theorem 1.4].

Proposition 4.3. *Every 1-quasiopen set $A \subset X$ is the union of a 1-finely open set and a $\mathcal{H}$-negligible set.*

Proof. Take open sets $G_j \subset X$ with $\mathrm{Cap}_1(G_j) < 2^{-j}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, such that each $A \cup G_j$ is an open set. By Proposition 3.8 we have $\mathrm{Cap}_1(\overline{G_j}^1) = \mathrm{Cap}_1(G_j) < 2^{-j}$. Let $D := A \cap \bigcap_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \overline{G_j}^1$, so that $\mathrm{Cap}_1(D) = 0$, and then also $\mathcal{H}(D) = 0$ by (3.4). Then for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $A \setminus \overline{G_j}^1 = A \cup G_j \setminus \overline{G_j}^1$ is a 1-finely open set, since it is the intersection of an open set and a 1-finely open set. The set

$$V := \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} (A \setminus \overline{G_j}^1) = A \setminus D$$

is a 1-finely open set, since it is the union of 1-finely open sets, and $A = V \cup D$. □

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\Omega \subset X$ be an open set and let $E \subset X$ be a μ-measurable set with $P(E, \Omega) < \infty$. Then each of the sets $I_E \cap \Omega$ and $O_E \cap \Omega$ is the union of a 1-finely open set and a $\mathcal{H}$-negligible set.*

Proof. Combine Propositions 4.2 and 4.3. □

Recall the characterizations of the 1-fine closure and the 1-fine boundary given in Corollary 3.7. When we consider measure theoretic interiors, things are simplified somewhat further.

Lemma 4.5. *For any μ-measurable set $E \subset X$, we have $\overline{I_E}^1 = b_1 I_E$ and $\overline{X \setminus I_E}^1 = b_1(X \setminus I_E)$.*

Proof. Applying Corollary 3.7, and the first claim of Lemma 3.1 with $A = I_E$, and noting that $I_A = I_E$, we obtain

$$\overline{I_E}^1 = I_E \cup b_1 I_E = b_1 I_E.$$

Similarly, by applying Corollary 3.7,

$$\overline{X \setminus I_E}^1 = (X \setminus I_E) \cup b_1(X \setminus I_E) = O_E \cup \partial^* E \cup b_1(X \setminus I_E) = b_1(X \setminus I_E),$$

where the last equality follows from the first claim of Lemma 3.1 with $A = X \setminus I_E$, by noting that $I_A = O_E$ and $\partial^* A = \partial^* E$. □

Lemma 4.6. *For any μ-measurable set $E \subset X$, we have*

$$\partial^1 I_E = b_1 I_E \cap b_1(X \setminus I_E).$$

Proof. By the definition of the 1-fine boundary and Lemma 4.5, we have

$$\partial^1 I_E = \overline{I_E}^1 \cap \overline{X \setminus I_E}^1 = b_1 I_E \cap b_1(X \setminus I_E).$$

□

Note that by Lemma 3.1, for any μ-measurable set $E \subset X$ we have $\partial^* E \subset \partial^1 I_E$. On the other hand, when E is of finite perimeter, these sets almost coincide. This is the content of the following theorem that is the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\Omega \subset X$ be an open set and let $E \subset X$ be a μ-measurable set with $P(E, \Omega) < \infty$. Then $\mathcal{H}((\partial^1 I_E \setminus \partial^* E) \cap \Omega) = 0$, and so in particular $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E \cap \Omega) < \infty$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.4 we know that there exist 1-finely open sets $A_1, A_2 \subset X$ and $\mathcal{H}$-negligible sets $N_1, N_2 \subset X$ such that $I_E \cap \Omega = A_1 \cup N_1$ and $O_E \cap \Omega = A_2 \cup N_2$. Take $x \in \Omega \setminus (\partial^* E \cup N_1 \cup N_2)$. Thus $x \in A_1 \cup A_2$. Suppose $x \in A_1$. Then

$$r\frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \setminus I_E, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \leq r\frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \setminus A_1, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \to 0$$

as $r \to 0$, since A_1 is a 1-finely open set. Thus $x \notin b_1(X \setminus I_E)$, and by Lemma 4.6, $x \notin \partial^1 I_E$. If $x \in A_2$, similarly

$$\begin{aligned} r\frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \cap I_E, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} &\leq r\frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \setminus O_E, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \\ &\leq r\frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \setminus A_2, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \to 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $r \to 0$, since A_2 is a 1-finely open set. Thus $x \notin b_1 I_E$, and so $x \notin \partial^1 I_E$. In conclusion, $(\partial^1 I_E \setminus \partial^* E) \cap \Omega \subset N_1 \cup N_2$, so that $\mathcal{H}((\partial^1 I_E \setminus \partial^* E) \cap \Omega) = 0$. By (2.12) we know that $\mathcal{H}(\partial^* E \cap \Omega) < \infty$, so now also $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E \cap \Omega) < \infty$. □

Note that we have the following.

Lemma 4.8. *For any μ-measurable set $E \subset X$, we have $\partial^1 I_E = \partial^1 O_E$.*

Proof. Fix $x \in \partial^1 O_E$. Then $x \in b_1 O_E$ by Lemma 4.6, and thus $x \in b_1(X \setminus I_E)$. We need to show that also $x \in b_1 I_E$. Note that for any $r > 0$, $B(x,r) \cap b_1 I_E \subset b_1(B(x,r) \cap I_E)$. By using Proposition 3.8 and the first claim of Lemma 3.1 with $A = I_E$ (note that $I_A = I_E$), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{r\to 0} r \frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \cap I_E, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \\
&\qquad \geq \limsup_{r\to 0} r \frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(b_1(B(x,r) \cap I_E), B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \\
&\qquad \geq \limsup_{r\to 0} r \frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \cap b_1 I_E, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \\
&\qquad \geq \limsup_{r\to 0} r \frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \cap (I_E \cup \partial^* I_E), B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} \\
&\qquad = \limsup_{r\to 0} r \frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \setminus O_E, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since $x \in b_1(X \setminus O_E)$ by Lemma 4.6. Thus $x \in \partial^1 I_E$. □

Remark 4.9. Despite the above lemma, $\partial^1 I_E$ seems in some way a strange set to consider, since we seem to obtain it by first taking an open set in the measure topology, and by then taking the boundary in a different topology, namely the 1-fine topology. To clarify the issue somewhat, let us see what happens if we define the measure topology in a more axiomatic way than is used in defining I_E, O_E, and $\partial^* E$. We say that a set $U \subset X$ is 0-finely open if

$$\lim_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r) \setminus U)}{\mu(B(x,r))} = 0$$

for every $x \in U$, that is, $U \subset I_U$. Then as in Definition 2.2, for any $G \subset X$ we can define the 0-fine interior 0-fine-int G, the 0-fine closure $\overline{G}^0$, and the 0-fine boundary $\partial^0 G := \overline{G}^0 \setminus$ 0-fine-int G. Moreover, let $b_0 G$ be the set of points where the density of G is *not* zero (somewhat confusingly), i.e. $b_0 G = X \setminus O_G$. Analogously to Proposition 3.6 and Corollary 3.7, we can then show that

$$0\text{-fine-int}\, G = G \setminus b_0(X \setminus G), \qquad \overline{G}^0 = G \cup b_0 G,$$

and

$$\partial^0 G = (G \cap b_0(X \setminus G)) \cup ((X \setminus G) \cap b_0 G).$$

Then as in Lemma 4.6, we have at least for any μ-measurable set $E \subset X$

$$\partial^0 I_E = b_0 I_E \cap b_0(X \setminus I_E).$$

But this is exactly $\partial^* I_E = \partial^* E$. Thus the measure theoretic boundary $\partial^* E$ is the boundary of I_E in the 0-fine topology (and not of E). Moreover, I_E is not the same as 0-fine-int $E = E \cap I_E$, so perhaps I_E should be viewed only as a measure theoretic concept, and not a topological one. Now the conclusion of Theorem 4.7 can be reformulated in the more symmetric fashion $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E \setminus \partial^0 I_E) = 0$.

Example 4.10. Let $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ (unweighted), and consider the slit disk

$$E = B(0,1) \setminus \{x = (x_1, x_2) : x_1 > 0,\, x_2 = 0\}.$$

Note that the 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^1$ is comparable to the codimension one Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}$. Now $\partial^* E = \partial B(0,1)$ and $P(E, \mathbb{R}^2) = \mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E) = 2\pi$. From Corollary 3.7 it follows that $\partial^1 E = \partial E$, so that $\partial^1 E \setminus \partial^* E$ consists of the slit, and so $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 E \setminus \partial^* E) > 0$. Similarly, fine-int $E = E$, and thus also $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 \text{ fine-int } E \setminus \partial^* E) > 0$.

Thus in Theorem 4.7, we cannot replace I_E by either E or fine-int E.

Example 4.11. Let $X = \mathbb{R}$ (unweighted). For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $r > 0$, and $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $B(x,r) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ we have

$$\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \cap A, B(x,2r)) \geq 2.$$

Thus we find that the metric topology and the 1-fine topology coincide, and so for any $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ we have $\partial^1 A = \partial A$. For a set of finite perimeter $E \subset \mathbb{R}$, the result $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E \setminus \partial^* E) = 0$ thus implies that $\partial I_E = \partial^* E$, since $\mathcal{H}$ is now (comparable to) the counting measure. Thus I_E is a *good representative* of E, a well-known result on the real line, see e.g. [2, Sections 3.2 & 3.5].

On the other hand, if we define

$$E := \mathbb{R} \setminus \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} [2^{-j}, 2^{-j} + 2^{-2j}],$$

then clearly $P(E, \mathbb{R}) = \infty$ and $0 \in I_E$. If $U \supset I_E$ is an open set, then U contains a neighborhood of the origin and thus $U \setminus I_E \neq \emptyset$. Thus $\operatorname{Cap}_1(U \setminus I_E) \geq 2$, since every point has 1-capacity 2. Thus I_E is not a 1-quasiopen set. Moreover, $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E \setminus \partial^* E) = \mathcal{H}(\{0\}) > 0$, so the conclusions of Proposition 4.2 and Theorem 4.7 do not necessarily hold unless E is of finite perimeter.

Given a set of finite perimeter $E \subset X$, if we denote by $\Sigma_\gamma E$ the subset of $\partial^* E$ where (2.11) holds, we know that $\mathcal{H}(\partial^* E \setminus \Sigma_\gamma E) = 0$. Theorem 4.7 then shows that the difference between $\partial^* E$ and the a priori larger set $\partial^1 I_E$ is also $\mathcal{H}$-negligible. In conclusion, the boundary of a set of finite perimeter is quite regular in the sense that all of these sets almost coincide.

5 Sufficiency of $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E) < \infty$

In this section we prove that the condition $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E) < \infty$ is also sufficient for E to be of finite perimeter.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\Omega \subset X$ be an open set, let $E \subset X$ be a μ-measurable set, and assume that $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E \cap \Omega) < \infty$. Then $P(E, \Omega) < \infty$.*

In proving this result, we will need to study the concept of *capacitary potential* in the case $p = 1$. Given an open set $U \subset X$ and an arbitrary set $H \subset U$, we define the variational BV-capacity by

$$\mathrm{cap}_{\mathrm{BV}}(H, U) := \inf \|Du\|(X),$$

where the infimum is taken over functions $u \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$ with $u \geq 1$ in a neighborhood of H and $u = 0$ in $X \setminus U$.

Note that by the coarea formula (2.6), we know that in fact

$$\mathrm{cap}_{\mathrm{BV}}(H, U) = \inf P(D, X),$$

where the infimum is taken over μ-measurable sets $D \subset U$ containing a neighborhood of H. Now we give a new characterization of the variational BV-capacity. First we take note of the following lemmas.

Lemma 5.2 ([21, Lemma 3.1])**.** *For any $G \subset X$, we can find an open set $V \supset G$ with $\mathrm{Cap}_1(V) \leq C_2 \mathrm{Cap}_1(G)$ and $P(V, X) \leq C_2 \mathrm{Cap}_1(G)$, where $C_2 = C_2(C_d, C_P, \lambda)$.*

Lemma 5.3 ([22, Lemma 3.9])**.** *Let $\Omega \subset X$ be an open set and let $u \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ with $\|Du\|(\Omega) < \infty$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $A \subset \Omega$ with $\mathrm{Cap}_1(A) < \delta$, then $\|Du\|(A) < \varepsilon$.*

Proposition 5.4. *Given an open set $U \subset X$ and $H \subset U$, we have*

$$\mathrm{cap}_{\mathrm{BV}}(H, U) = \inf P(D, X),$$

where the infimum is taken over μ-measurable sets $D \subset U$ with $H \subset I_D$.

Proof. One inequality is clear. To prove the opposite inequality, we can assume that there exists a μ-measurable set $D \subset U$ with $H \subset I_D$ and $P(D, X) < \infty$. By applying the coarea formula (2.6), we find open sets $U_i \Subset U$ with $U = \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} U_i$, and $P(U_i, X) < \infty$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and then fix $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 5.3 there exists $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$ such that if $A \subset X$ with $\mathrm{Cap}_1(A) < \delta$, then

$$P(U_i, A) < \frac{2^{-i-1}\alpha\varepsilon}{C_d}; \tag{5.1}$$

recall the constant α from (2.12). By Proposition 4.2 we find a set $G_i \subset X$ with

$$\mathrm{Cap}_1(G_i) < \frac{2^{-i-1}\alpha\delta}{C_d C_2}$$

such that $(I_D \cap U_i) \cup G_i$ is an open set. By Lemma 5.2 we find an open set $V_i \supset G_i$ with $\mathrm{Cap}_1(V_i) < \delta$ and $P(V_i, X) < 2^{-i-1}\alpha\varepsilon/C_d$. By Proposition 3.8, also $\mathrm{Cap}_1(I_{V_i}) < \delta$. Clearly $\partial^*(U_i \cap V_i) \subset (\partial^* U_i \cap I_{V_i}) \cup \partial^* V_i$. By (2.5), $P(U_i \cup V_i, X) < \infty$, and then by (2.12),

$$\begin{aligned} P(U_i \cap V_i, X) &\leq C_d \mathcal{H}(\partial^*(U_i \cap V_i)) \\ &\leq C_d(\mathcal{H}(\partial^* U_i \cap I_{V_i}) + \mathcal{H}(\partial^* V_i)) \\ &\leq C_d \alpha^{-1}(P(U_i, I_{V_i}) + P(V_i, X)) \\ &\overset{(5.1)}{\leq} C_d \alpha^{-1}(2^{-i-1}\alpha\varepsilon/C_d + 2^{-i-1}\alpha\varepsilon/C_d) \\ &= 2^{-i}\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

This can be done for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and then the set

$$(I_D \cap U) \cup \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} (U_i \cap V_i) = \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} (I_D \cup V_i) \cap U_i = \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} ((I_D \cap U_i) \cup V_i) \cap U_i$$

contains H, is contained in U, and is an open set since each $(I_D \cap U_i) \cup V_i$ and each U_i is an open set. Moreover, by the fact that $\mu((I_D \cap U)\Delta D) = 0$, and by the lower semicontinuity and subadditivity (2.5) of perimeter,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left((I_D \cap U) \cup \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} (U_i \cap V_i), X\right) &= P\left(D \cup \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} (U_i \cap V_i), X\right) \\ &\leq P(D, X) + \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} P(U_i \cap V_i, X) \\ &\leq P(D, X) + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

by (5.2). Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we obtain the result. □

Remark 5.5. The above proposition essentially states that the BV-capacity turns out to be an outer capacity even if we do not define it as such. This is similar to [7, Theorem 4.1], where it is shown that the variational capacity cap_p is an outer capacity under very weak assumptions.

Moreover, Proposition 5.4 and another application of the coarea formula give

$$\operatorname{cap}_{\mathrm{BV}}(H, U) = \inf \|Du\|(X), \tag{5.3}$$

where the infimum is taken over functions $u \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$ with $u^\wedge \geq 1$ in H and $u = 0$ in $X \setminus U$ (more precisely, $u = 0$ μ-almost everywhere in $X \setminus U$; recall that we understand BV functions to be μ-equivalence classes).

Following the definitions and terminology used in the case $p > 1$, we give the following definition.

Definition 5.6. Given an open set $U \subset X$ and $H \subset U$, we say that a μ-measurable set $D \subset U$ is a 1-capacitary potential for H in U if $H \subset I_D$ and

$$P(D, X) = \operatorname{cap}_{\mathrm{BV}}(H, U) < \infty.$$

Of course, Proposition 5.4 guarantees that this definition makes sense. Almost any example on the real line shows that a 1-capacitary potential is not unique, contrary to the case $p > 1$. However, we have the following existence result.

Proposition 5.7. *Let $U \subset X$ be an open set and let $H \subset X$ with $I_H \subset U$. If $\operatorname{cap}_{\mathrm{BV}}(I_H, U) < \infty$, then a 1-capacitary potential for I_H in U exists.*

Note that here we do not even need H to be μ-measurable. However, it can be shown that I_H, O_H, and $\partial^* H$ are still Borel sets.

Proof. Take a sequence of μ-measurable sets $D_i \subset U$ with $I_H \subset I_{D_i}$ and

$$P(D_i, X) \to \operatorname{cap}_{\mathrm{BV}}(I_H, U).$$

By the weak compactness of BV functions, see [25, Theorem 3.7], there exists $D \subset U$ such that by passing to a subsequence (not relabeled), $\chi_{D_i} \to \chi_D$ in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$. By the lower semicontinuity of perimeter with respect to convergence in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$, we have

$$P(D, X) \leq \liminf_{i \to \infty} P(D_i, X) = \operatorname{cap}_{\mathrm{BV}}(I_H, U).$$

Fix $x \in X$ and $R > 0$. Since also $\chi_{X\setminus D_i} \to \chi_{X\setminus D}$ in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$, we have

$$\mu(B(x,R)\cap I_H \setminus D) = \int_{B(x,R)\cap I_H} \chi_{X\setminus D}\, d\mu = \lim_{i\to\infty} \int_{B(x,R)\cap I_H} \chi_{X\setminus D_i}\, d\mu = 0$$

since $\mu(I_H \setminus D_i) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ (by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem). By letting $R \to \infty$, we get $\mu(I_H \setminus D) = 0$, and so $I_H \subset I_D$. Then D is a 1-capacitary potential for I_H in U. □

The crux of the proof of Theorem 5.1 is obtaining the following *Choquet*-type property in the case $p = 1$. For this, we combine ideas from the proof of the case $p > 1$ given in [8, Theorem 7.1] with methods of metric space BV theory, see especially [1, Theorem 5.3].

Proposition 5.8. *Let $A \subset X$ be a μ-measurable set and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists an open set $U \subset X$ with $U \cup b_1 A = X$ and*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_1(U \cap \overline{I_A}^1) < \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let $\{B(x_j, r_j)\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a covering of X by balls such that every point is covered by arbitrarily small balls; this is possible since the space is separable. We can assume that $r_j < \mathrm{diam}(X)/8$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, by [19, Lemma 6.2] there exists $s \in [r_j, 2r_j]$ such that

$$P(B(x_j, s)) \le 2C_d \frac{\mu(B(x_j, s))}{s} < \infty.$$

In particular, $\mathrm{cap}_{\mathrm{BV}}(I_{B(x_j,r_j)\cap A}, B(x_j, 2r_j)) < \infty$, and so by Proposition 5.7, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we can let $D_j \subset X$ be a 1-capacitary potential for $I_{B(x_j,r_j)\cap A}$ in $B(x_j, 2r_j)$. Then $B(x_j, r_j) \cap I_A \subset I_{D_j}$, and thus

$$B(x_j, r_j) \cap O_{D_j} \cap I_A = \emptyset \qquad \text{for each } j \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5.4}$$

Claim: We have $\mathcal{H}\left(X \setminus \left(b_1 A \cup \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} (B(x_j, r_j) \cap O_{D_j})\right)\right) = 0$.

Proof: For any set of finite perimeter $E \subset X$, denote by $\Sigma_\gamma E$ the subset of $\partial^* E$ where (2.11) holds. Then let

$$N := \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \partial^* D_j \setminus \Sigma_\gamma D_j,$$

so that $\mathcal{H}(N) = 0$. Fix $x \in X \setminus (b_1 A \cup N)$. If for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $x \in B(x_j, r_j)$ and

$$\liminf_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r) \cap D_j)}{\mu(B(x,r))} < \gamma,$$

then $x \in B(x_j, r_j) \cap O_{D_j}$. We assume that

$$\liminf_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r) \cap D_j)}{\mu(B(x,r))} \geq \gamma \tag{5.5}$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $x \in B(x_j, r_j)$, and derive a contradiction, thus proving the claim. Define $\delta > 0$ by

$$\delta := \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma}{2}, \frac{1}{(3C_{SP})^Q C_d^{(1+\lceil \log_2(4\lambda) \rceil)(Q+1)}} \right\}.$$

Here $\lceil a \rceil$ is the smallest integer at least $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and C_{SP} is the constant appearing in the relative isoperimetric inequality (2.7). Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $B(x_j, r_j) \ni x$, and $r_j > 0$ is so small that

$$r \frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,r) \cap A, B(x,2r))}{\mu(B(x,r))} < \frac{\delta}{5 C_d^3 C_S^2} \tag{5.6}$$

for all $r \in (0, 2r_j]$, where C_S is the constant from the Sobolev inequality (2.8). For any such r, using the definition of the variational capacity, we find $u_r \in N^{1,1}(X)$ with $u_r \geq 1$ in $B(x,r) \cap A$, $u = 0$ in $X \setminus B(x,2r)$, and

$$\frac{\delta}{5 C_d^3 C_S^2} \geq \frac{r}{\mu(B(x,r))} \int_X g_{u_r} \, d\mu \geq \frac{r}{\mu(B(x,r))} \|Du_r\|(X),$$

where g_{u_r} is an upper gradient of u_r, and where the last inequality follows from the fact that Lipschitz functions are dense in $N^{1,1}(X)$, see e.g. [5, Theorem 5.1]. By using the coarea formula (2.6), we find a number $t \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\frac{r}{\mu(B(x,r))} P(\{u_r > t\}, X) \leq \frac{\delta}{5 C_d^3 C_S^2}.$$

In conclusion, for any $r \in (0, 2r_j]$ there exists a set $D \subset B(x,2r)$ covering $B(x,r) \cap A$ such that

$$\frac{r}{\mu(B(x,r))} P(D, X) \leq \frac{\delta}{5 C_d^3 C_S^2}. \tag{5.7}$$

On the other hand, by using [5, Lemma 11.22], the doubling property of the measure, and (5.6) with $r = 2r_j$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r_j \frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x_j,r_j)\cap A, B(x_j,2r_j))}{\mu(B(x_j,r_j))} &\le 5C_S r_j \frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x_j,r_j)\cap A, B(x_j,4r_j))}{\mu(B(x_j,r_j))} \\ &\le 5C_S C_d^2 r_j \frac{\operatorname{cap}_1(B(x,2r_j)\cap A, B(x,4r_j))}{\mu(B(x,2r_j))} \\ &< \frac{\delta}{2C_d C_S}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Then as above, we conclude that there exists a set $\widetilde{D} \subset B(x_j, 2r_j)$ with $\widetilde{D} \supset B(x_j, r_j) \cap A$ and

$$\frac{r_j}{\mu(B(x_j,r_j))} P(\widetilde{D}, X) < \frac{\delta}{2C_d C_S}.$$

Note that $I_{B(x_j,r_j)\cap A} \subset I_{\widetilde{D}}$, and so $\widetilde{D}$ is admissible for $\operatorname{cap}_{\mathrm{BV}}(I_{B(x_j,r_j)\cap A}, B(x_j, 2r_j))$. Then since $D_j \subset X$ is a 1-capacitary potential for $I_{B(x_j,r_j)\cap A}$ in $B(x_j, 2r_j)$, we necessarily have also

$$\frac{r_j}{\mu(B(x_j,r_j))} P(D_j, X) < \frac{\delta}{2C_d C_S}. \tag{5.9}$$

By (5.5) we have

$$\liminf_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r)\cap D_j)}{\mu(B(x,r))} > \delta.$$

However,

$$\frac{\mu(B(x,r)\cap D_j)}{\mu(B(x,r))} < \delta \qquad \text{for all } r \ge r_j; \tag{5.10}$$

this can be seen as follows. Let $r \ge r_j$, and note that $D_j \subset B(x_j, 2r_j)$. By the isoperimetric inequality (2.9) and (5.9),

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B(x,r)\cap D_j) \le \mu(D_j) &\le 2C_S r_j P(D_j, X) \\ &< 2C_S r_j \frac{\delta \mu(B(x_j,r_j))}{2C_d C_S r_j} = \frac{\delta \mu(B(x_j,r_j))}{C_d}. \end{aligned}$$

But now $B(x_j, r_j) \subset B(x, 2r)$, and so by the doubling property of the measure,

$$\mu(B(x_j,r_j)) \le C_d \mu(B(x,r)),$$

establishing (5.10). Thus we can define $R \in (0, r_j]$ by

$$R := \inf\left\{ r > 0 : \ \frac{\mu(B(x,r) \cap D_j)}{\mu(B(x,r))} < \delta \right\}.$$

Clearly

$$\frac{\mu(B(x,R) \cap D_j)}{\mu(B(x,R))} < C_d \delta. \tag{5.11}$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\mu(B(x,R/(4\lambda)) \cap D_j)}{\mu(B(x,R/(4\lambda)))} \le C_d^{1+\lceil \log_2(4\lambda)\rceil} \delta \le \frac{1}{2}. \tag{5.12}$$

Thus by the definition of R, the relative isoperimetric inequality (2.7), and (5.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \frac{\mu(B(x,R))}{C_d^{\lceil \log_2(4\lambda)\rceil}} &\le \delta \mu(B(x,R/(4\lambda))) \\
&\le \mu(B(x,R/(4\lambda)) \cap D_j) \\
&\le 2C_{SP} \frac{R}{4\lambda} \left(\frac{\mu(B(x,R/(4\lambda)) \cap D_j)}{\mu(B(x,R/(4\lambda)))} \right)^{1/Q} P(D_j, B(x,R/2)) \\
&\le C_{SP} \frac{R}{2\lambda} \left(C_d^{1+\lceil \log_2(4\lambda)\rceil} \delta \right)^{1/Q} P(D_j, B(x,R/2)).
\end{aligned}$$

By the choice of δ, this implies that

$$P(D_j, B(x,R/2)) \ge 6C_d \delta \frac{\mu(B(x,R))}{R}. \tag{5.13}$$

But by (5.7), we find a μ-measurable set $D \subset B(x,2R)$ covering $B(x,R) \cap A$ such that

$$P(D,X) \le \frac{\delta}{5C_d^3 C_S^2} \frac{\mu(B(x,R))}{R}. \tag{5.14}$$

Then by the isoperimetric inequality (2.9), we have

$$\mu(D) \le 2C_S R P(D,X) \le \frac{\delta \mu(B(x,R))}{C_d^3 C_S}. \tag{5.15}$$

Take $\eta \in \mathrm{Lip}_c(X)$ with $0 \le \eta \le 1$, $\eta = 1$ in $B(x,R/2)$, $\eta = 0$ in $X \setminus B(x,R)$, and with an upper gradient $g_\eta \le 2/R$. Let

$$w := \eta \chi_{I_D} + (1-\eta)\chi_{I_{D_j}}.$$

Then by a Leibniz rule, see [15, Lemma 3.2],

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|Dw\|(X)\\
&\quad\le P(D, B(x,R)) + P(D_j, X\setminus B(x,R/2)) + \int_{D\cup D_j} g_\eta \, d\mu\\
&\quad\overset{(5.14)}{\le} \frac{\delta\mu(B(x,R))}{5C_d^3C_S^2R} + P(D_j, X\setminus B(x,R/2)) + \frac{2\mu(B(x,R)\cap(D\cup D_j))}{R}\\
&\quad\le \frac{\delta\mu(B(x,R))}{5C_d^3C_S^2R} + P(D_j, X\setminus B(x,R/2)) + \frac{2\delta}{R}\left(\frac{1}{C_d^3C_S} + C_d\right)\mu(B(x,R))
\end{aligned}$$

by (5.11) and (5.15). Thus by (5.13)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|Dw\|(X) - P(D_j, X)\\
&\qquad\le \frac{\delta\mu(B(x,R))}{5C_d^3C_S^2R} + \frac{2\delta}{R}\left(\frac{1}{C_d^3C_S} + C_d\right)\mu(B(x,R)) - P(D_j, B(x,R/2))\\
&\qquad\le \frac{\delta\mu(B(x,R))}{5C_d^3C_S^2R} + \frac{2\delta}{R}\left(\frac{1}{C_d^3C_S} + C_d\right)\mu(B(x,R)) - 6C_d\delta\frac{\mu(B(x,R))}{R}\\
&\qquad\le -C_d\delta\frac{\mu(B(x,R))}{R} < 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

Recall that $I_{B(x_j,r_j)\cap A} \subset I_{D_j}$. Since $B(x,R)\cap A \subset D$, also $I_{B(x_j,r_j)\cap A} \cap B(x,R) \subset I_D$. Thus we have $I_{B(x_j,r_j)\cap A} \subset \{w = 1\}$, and so $I_{B(x_j,r_j)\cap A} \subset \{w^\wedge = 1\}$. Since also $B(x,R)\subset B(x_j,2r_j)$, we have $w = 0$ in $X\setminus B(x_j,2r_j)$. But now (5.16) is a contradiction by (5.3), since D_j is a 1-capacitary potential for $I_{B(x_j,r_j)\cap A}$ in $B(x_j,2r_j)$. Thus the claim is proved.

By the claim, we have

$$b_1 A \cup \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \big(B(x_j,r_j)\cap O_{D_j}\big) \cup N = X, \tag{5.17}$$

where $\mathcal{H}(N) = 0$. Since each $B(x_j,r_j)\cap O_{D_j}$ is 1-quasiopen by Proposition 4.2, there exist open sets $G_j \subset X$ with $\mathrm{Cap}_1(G_j) < 2^{-j-1}\varepsilon$ such that each

$$U_j := (B(x_j,r_j)\cap O_{D_j}) \cup G_j$$

is open. For the exceptional set N with $\mathcal{H}(N) = 0$, we have also $\mathrm{Cap}_1(N) = 0$ by (3.4), and then since Cap_1 is an outer capacity, we find an open set $V \supset N$

with $\mathrm{Cap}_1(V) < \varepsilon/2$. Let $U := \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} U_j \cup V$. Then by (5.17), $b_1 A \cup U = X$. By (5.4),

$$\mathrm{Cap}_1(U \cap I_A) = \mathrm{Cap}_1\left(\left(\bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} G_j \cup V\right) \cap I_A\right) \leq \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \mathrm{Cap}_1(G_j) + \mathrm{Cap}_1(V) < \varepsilon.$$

Note that since U is open,

$$U \cap b_1 I_A \subset b_1(U \cap I_A).$$

Moreover, $\overline{I_A}^1 = b_1 I_A$ by Lemma 4.5. Combining these,

$$U \cap \overline{I_A}^1 = U \cap b_1 I_A \subset b_1(U \cap I_A) \subset \overline{U \cap I_A}^1.$$

Now by Proposition 3.8,

$$\mathrm{Cap}_1(U \cap \overline{I_A}^1) \leq \mathrm{Cap}_1(\overline{U \cap I_A}^1) = \mathrm{Cap}_1(U \cap I_A) < \varepsilon.$$

□

Remark 5.9. The Claim whose proof took up the bulk of the proof of Proposition 5.8 can be seen as a weak analog of the *Cartan property* that holds in the case $p > 1$, see [8, Theorem 1.1].

A more exact analog of the Choquet property that is known to hold for $p > 1$, see [8, Theorem 7.1], is given in the following open problem.

Open Problem. Let $A \subset X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Can we find an open set $U \subset X$ such that $U \cup b_1 A = X$ and $\mathrm{Cap}_1(U \cap A) < \varepsilon$?

Proposition 5.10. *For any μ-measurable set $E \subset X$, $X \setminus \overline{I_E}^1$ is a 1-quasiopen set.*

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. By applying Proposition 5.8 with $A = I_E$, and noting that $I_A = I_E$, we find an open set $U \supset X \setminus b_1 I_E \supset X \setminus \overline{I_E}^1$ such that

$$\mathrm{Cap}_1(U \cap \overline{I_E}^1) < \varepsilon.$$

Since Cap_1 is an outer capacity, we find an open set $G \supset U \cap \overline{I_E}^1$ with $\mathrm{Cap}_1(G) < \varepsilon$. Thus the set

$$(X \setminus \overline{I_E}^1) \cup G = U \cup G$$

is open, and thus $X \setminus \overline{I_E}^1$ is a 1-quasiopen set. □

Open Problem. Is every 1-finely open set 1-quasiopen?

Note that Proposition 5.10 gives a partial result in this direction, since $X \setminus \overline{I_E}^1$ is of course a 1-finely open set. Moreover, a positive answer to this open problem would follow from a positive answer to the previous open problem, just as Proposition 5.10 follows from Proposition 5.8.

Corollary 5.11. *For any μ-measurable set $E \subset X$, $I_E \setminus \partial^1 I_E$ and $O_E \setminus \partial^1 I_E$ are 1-quasiopen sets.*

Proof. By the definition of the 1-fine boundary and the second claim of Lemma 3.1, and noting that $\partial^* E = \partial^* I_E$,

$$X \setminus \overline{I_E}^1 = X \setminus (I_E \cup \partial^1 I_E) = O_E \setminus \partial^1 I_E.$$

Thus by Proposition 5.10, $O_E \setminus \partial^1 I_E$ is a 1-quasiopen set. Since $\partial^1 I_E = \partial^1 O_E$ by Lemma 4.8, $I_E \setminus \partial^1 I_E$ is also a 1-quasiopen set. □

Proposition 5.12. *Let $E \subset X$ be a μ-measurable set and let Γ be the family of curves for which $\gamma(0) \in I_E$ and $\gamma(\ell_\gamma) \in O_E$, but γ does not intersect $\partial^1 I_E$. Then $\operatorname{Mod}_1(\Gamma) = 0$.*

Proof. By Corollary 5.11, $I_E \setminus \partial^1 I_E$ and $O_E \setminus \partial^1 I_E$ are 1-quasiopen sets. Thus by [26, Remark 3.5] they are also 1-*path open* sets, meaning that for 1-almost every curve γ, the sets $\gamma^{-1}(I_E \setminus \partial^1 I_E)$ and $\gamma^{-1}(O_E \setminus \partial^1 I_E)$ are relatively open subsets of $[0, \ell_\gamma]$. Pick such γ, and suppose that $\gamma(0) \in I_E$ and $\gamma(\ell_\gamma) \in O_E$. Since $[0, \ell_\gamma]$ is connected, there exists $t \in (0, \ell_\gamma)$ for which

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(t) &\in (X \setminus (I_E \setminus \partial^1 I_E)) \cap (X \setminus (O_E \setminus \partial^1 I_E)) \\
&= (O_E \cup \partial^* E \cup \partial^1 I_E) \cap (I_E \cup \partial^* E \cup \partial^1 I_E) \\
&= (O_E \cup \partial^1 I_E) \cap (I_E \cup \partial^1 I_E) \\
&= \partial^1 I_E.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Using Proposition 5.12, we can now prove Theorem 5.1 by an argument very similar to one used previously in [23, Theorem 6.5].

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E \cap \Omega) < \infty$, we can find a covering of $\partial^1 I_E \cap \Omega$ by balls $B_j = B(x_j, r_j)$ with radii $r_j \le \varepsilon$ such that

$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\mu(B_j)}{r_j} \le \mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E \cap \Omega) + \varepsilon.$$

Denote $2B_j := B(x_j, 2r_j)$. For each ball B_j in the cover, we fix a $1/r_j$-Lipschitz function v_j such that $0 \le v_j \le 1$ on X, $v_j = 1$ in B_j, and $v_j = 0$ in $X \setminus 2B_j$. Now let

$$u(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in I_E, \\ \min\left\{1, \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} v_j(x)\right\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, let $v(x) := \min\left\{1, \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} v_j(x)\right\}$, and

$$g := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{r_j} \chi_{2B_j}.$$

Clearly g is an upper gradient of v. We will show that g is also a 1-weak upper gradient of u in Ω. Take a curve $\gamma \notin \Gamma$ in Ω with end points $x, y \in \Omega$, where Γ was defined in Proposition 5.12. If $x, y \in \Omega \setminus I_E$, then

$$|u(x) - u(y)| = |v(x) - v(y)| \le \int_\gamma g \, ds.$$

If $x, y \in I_E \cap \Omega$, then $u(x) = u(y)$, and hence the upper gradient inequality

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \le \int_\gamma g \, ds$$

is satisfied.

Finally, if $x \in I_E \cap \Omega$ and $y \in \Omega \setminus I_E$, then since $\gamma \notin \Gamma$, there is some $t \in [0, \ell_\gamma]$ such that $\gamma(t) \in \partial^1 I_E$, and thus $\gamma(t) \in B_k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $u(\gamma(0)) = u(x) = 1$, $u(\gamma(t)) = v(\gamma(t)) = 1$, and $u(y) = v(y)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - u(y)| &\le |u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(t))| + |u(\gamma(t)) - u(\gamma(\ell_\gamma))| \\ &= |v(\gamma(t)) - v(\gamma(\ell_\gamma))| \le \int_\gamma g \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

Thus in all cases the pair u, g satisfies the upper gradient inequality for $\gamma \notin \Gamma$ in Ω, and so g is a 1-weak upper gradient of u in Ω. Furthermore,

$$\int_\Omega g \, d\mu \le \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\mu(2B_j)}{r_j} \le C_d \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\mu(B_j)}{r_j} \le C_d(\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E \cap \Omega) + \varepsilon) < \infty.$$

Now for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, use the above construction to obtain functions $u_i \in N^{1,1}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$, $g_i \in L^1(\Omega)$ corresponding to $\varepsilon = 1/i$. Note that in order to show that $P(E,\Omega) < \infty$, it is enough to show that $u_i \to \chi_E$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ and that $\|g_i\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$ is a bounded sequence, since for every $u_i \in N^{1,1}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ we can find a function $w_i \in \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ with $\|w_i - u_i\|_{N^{1,1}(\Omega)} < 1/i$, see [5, Theorem 5.47]. The sequence $\|g_i\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$ is clearly bounded, and moreover (note that below, the balls B_j also depend on i)

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |u_i - \chi_E| \, d\mu &\le \int_\Omega \chi_{\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} 2B_j} \, d\mu \le \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \mu(2B_j) \le \frac{1}{i} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\mu(2B_j)}{r_j} \\ &\le (\mathcal{H}(\partial^1 I_E \cap \Omega) + 1)/i \to 0\end{aligned}$$

as $i \to \infty$. □

Remark 5.13. We still do not know whether $\mathcal{H}(\partial^* E \cap \Omega) < \infty$ implies $P(E,\Omega) < \infty$. It is also not clear whether Proposition 5.12 would hold with $\partial^1 I_E$ replaced by $\partial^* E$. If the answer to the latter question is yes, however, the proof would need to be something different, since Corollary 5.11 is not true with $\partial^1 I_E$ replaced by $\partial^* E$, as demonstrated by the latter part of Example 4.11.

References

[1] L. Ambrosio, *Fine properties of sets of finite perimeter in doubling metric measure spaces*, Calculus of variations, nonsmooth analysis and related topics. Set-Valued Anal. 10 (2002), no. 2-3, 111–128.

[2] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, and D. Pallara, *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems.* Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.

[3] L. Ambrosio, M. Miranda, Jr., and D. Pallara, *Special functions of bounded variation in doubling metric measure spaces*, Calculus of variations: topics from the mathematical heritage of E. De Giorgi, 1–45, Quad. Mat., 14, Dept. Math., Seconda Univ. Napoli, Caserta, 2004.

[4] L. Ambrosio and P. Tilli, *Topics on analysis in metric spaces*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 25. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004. viii+133 pp.

[5] A. Björn and J. Björn, *Nonlinear potential theory on metric spaces*, EMS Tracts in Mathematics, 17. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2011. xii+403 pp.

[6] A. Björn and J. Björn, *Obstacle and Dirichlet problems on arbitrary nonopen sets in metric spaces, and fine topology*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. 31 (2015), no. 1, 161–214.

[7] A. Björn and J. Björn, *The variational capacity with respect to nonopen sets in metric spaces*, Potential Anal. 40 (2014), no. 1, 57–80.

[8] A. Björn, J. Björn, and V. Latvala, *The Cartan, Choquet and Kellogg properties for the fine topology on metric spaces*, to appear in J. Anal. Math.

[9] A. Björn, J. Björn, and V. Latvala, *The weak Cartan property for the p-fine topology on metric spaces*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 64 (2015), no. 3, 915–941.

[10] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics series, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1992.

[11] H. Federer, *Geometric measure theory*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 153 Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York 1969 xiv+676 pp.

[12] E. Giusti, *Minimal surfaces and functions of bounded variation*, Monographs in Mathematics, 80. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1984. xii+240 pp.

[13] P. Hajłasz, *Sobolev spaces on metric-measure spaces*, Heat kernels and analysis on manifolds, graphs, and metric spaces (Paris, 2002), 173–218, Contemp. Math., 338, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.

[14] H. Hakkarainen and J. Kinnunen, *The BV-capacity in metric spaces*, Manuscripta Math. 132 (2010), no. 1-2, 51–73.

[15] H. Hakkarainen, R. Korte, P. Lahti, and N. Shanmugalingam, *Stability and continuity of functions of least gradient*, Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces 3 (2015), Art. 9.

[16] J. Heinonen, T. Kilpeläinen, and O. Martio, *Nonlinear potential theory of degenerate elliptic equations*, Unabridged republication of the 1993 original. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2006. xii+404 pp.

[17] J. Heinonen and P. Koskela, *Quasiconformal maps in metric spaces with controlled geometry*, Acta Math. 181 (1998), no. 1, 1–61.

[18] J. Heinonen, P. Koskela, N. Shanmugalingam, and J. Tyson, *Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces. An approach based on upper gradients*, New Mathematical Monographs, 27. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015. xii+434 pp.

[19] J. Kinnunen, R. Korte, N. Shanmugalingam, and H. Tuominen, *A characterization of Newtonian functions with zero boundary values*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 43 (2012), no. 3-4, 507–528.

[20] R. Korte and P. Lahti, *Relative isoperimetric inequalities and sufficient conditions for finite perimeter on metric spaces*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 31 (2014), no. 1, 129–154.

[21] P. Lahti, *A notion of fine continuity for* BV *functions on metric spaces*, to appear in Potential Analysis.

[22] P. Lahti, *Strong approximation of sets of finite perimeter in metric spaces*, preprint 2016, https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.06162

[23] P. Lahti and N. Shanmugalingam, *Fine properties and a notion of quasicontinuity for* BV *functions on metric spaces*, to appear in J. Math. Pures Appl.

[24] J. Malý and W. Ziemer, *Fine regularity of solutions of elliptic partial differential equations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 51. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997. xiv+291 pp.

[25] M. Miranda, Jr., *Functions of bounded variation on "good" metric spaces*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 82 (2003), no. 8, 975–1004.

[26] N. Shanmugalingam, *Harmonic functions on metric spaces*, Illinois J. Math. 45 (2001), no. 3, 1021–1050.

[27] N. Shanmugalingam, *Newtonian spaces: An extension of Sobolev spaces to metric measure spaces*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 16(2) (2000), 243–279.

[28] W. P. Ziemer, *Weakly differentiable functions. Sobolev spaces and functions of bounded variation*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 120. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.

Address:

Department of Mathematical Sciences
4199 French Hall West
University of Cincinnati
2815 Commons Way
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0025
E-mail: `lahtipk@ucmail.uc.edu`